



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/538,970	06/14/2005	Gerhard Heitze	HM-641PCT	9495
40570	7590	01/29/2009		
FRIEDRICH KUEFFNER 317 MADISON AVENUE, SUITE 910 NEW YORK, NY 10017			EXAMINER LANDRUM, EDWARD F	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3724	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/29/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/538,970	Applicant(s) HEITZE ET AL.	
	Examiner EDWARD LANDRUM	Art Unit 3724	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 December 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 5-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 5-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 5-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The phrase “ the blades of the lower pair of blades being attached to the lower blade holder so that the blades of the lower pair of blades are loosenable from the lower blade holder independently of one another” is new matter. Applicant never previously states in the disclosure that this is possible.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 5, 6, and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mckee (European Publication No. 0075448) in view of Petros et al (U.S Patent No. 3,643,537), hereinafter Petros.

Mckee teaches (see Figure 1) a crank shear comprising two pairs of blades (4 and 5) mounted on blade holders (2 and 3), wherein the blade holders (2 and 3) are supported opposite each other in a vertical plane in a pair of eccentric shafts (circular portion found in the middle of both 2 and 3). The eccentric shafts are pivoted on levers (6 and 20) in double joint mechanisms (7 and 21). The blade holders (2 and 3) have many pairs of axially parallel bearing surfaces and radial projections (to the left of blade 4, between blades 4 and 5, and after blade 5; see Figure 1). The upper blade holder (2) has inner facing bearing surfaces within a recess that the blades (4 and 5) are arranged on. The lower blade holder (3) has outer, oppositely directed bearing surfaces of a narrow projection (projecting attachment portion found between the blades on the lower blade holder) oriented towards the recess.

When support levers (6 and 20) are spread to form an approximately 90 degree angle an upper piston rod device (11) attached to the double joint mechanism (7) is fully extended and a lower piston rod device (25) attached to the double joint mechanism (21) is retracted. When support levers (6 and 20) are brought together to become substantially parallel to the strip of material being cut (30) the upper piston rod device (11) attached to the double joint mechanism (7) is fully retracted and the lower piston rod device (25) attached to the double joint mechanism (21) is extended. In this position the upper and lower double joint mechanisms (7 and 21) extended approximately linearly with each other (see Figure 1). Furthermore Mckee teaches (Pg. 6, lines 2—27; Pg. 7, lines 1-6) the upper blade carrier (2) being able to be swung to a position outside of its normal shearing position to make it easier to replace the blades (4

and 5). As seen in Figure 1 each lower blade has a face that faces away from the other blade. Both of these faces have a completely exposed surface (top portion of each outward face extending above the lower blade holder 3).

Mckee teaches all of the elements of the current invention as stated above except the exposed surfaces being entire faces of the lower blades, the lower blades being independently loosenable from the projection of the lower blade holder, the upper blade recess being curved, and the projection being formed of a single piece with the lower blade holder.

Petros teaches (Figure 4) that it is old and well known to attach blades (64, 68, and anvils of 70 and 72) on a shearing device in a manner that completely exposes the entire face of the blades. Fries further teaches independently attaching each blade of both the upper and the lower sections of the device (see the independent bolt and nut connections for each blade as shown in Figure 4).

It would have been obvious to have modified Mckee to incorporate the teachings of Petros to expose entire surfaces of the lower blades and independently attach the lower blades to the lower blade holder because the connection types of Mckee and Petros were art recognized equivalents at the time of the invention in shearing applications. One of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to substitute the blade connections of Petros for the connections of Mckee. Furthermore, applicant has not disclosed that independently connecting each lower blade or having an entire face of each lower blade be exposed solves any stated problem or is for any particular

purpose, and it appears that the shearing device would perform equally well with the blades being attached with any known connection means.

It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to modify Mckee to have the recess the inner blades be curved, since Applicant has not disclosed that having a curved recess in the upper blade holder solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears that the shearing device would perform equally well with any shape recess provided the recess sufficiently supported the cutting blades.

Furthermore, it has been held the use of a one piece construction instead of structure formed of more than one piece would be merely an obvious engineering choice. Therefore it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to modify Mckee by having the projection be formed as one piece with the lower blade holder, since applicant has not disclosed that having the projection being formed on the lower blade holder solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears the clamps would perform equally well with or without the projection being formed with the lower blade holder.

5. Claims 7 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified device of Mckee in view of Fries (U.S Patent No. 3,643,537).

The modified device of Mckee teaches all of the elements of the current invention as stated above except the blade holders capable of being moved away from the material being cut to allow passage of the material.

Fries teaches (Col. 1, lines 1-9) a pair of shearing arms capable of being rotated out of position for the purpose of executing a variably adjustable number of miss-cuts between effective cutting operations.

It would have been obvious to have modified Mckee to incorporate the teachings of Fries to allow the cutters to be rotated about the eccentric shafts to non-cutting positions for the purpose of allowing material to be passed through the machine without being cut. This would allow the shearing machine to shear variable length work pieces without having to turn off the entire machine or take both of the cutting heads out of the machine.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 5-9 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Elineau (U.S Patent No. 3,398,616), and Kagerhuber et al (U.S Patent No. 4,237,760) teach shearing devices that allow the blades to be positioned away from the material to be cut to allow passage of the material. Fries (U.S Patent No. 3,643,537) and the aforementioned Elineau teach lower blades with entire faces of a blade being exposed.

Art Unit: 3724

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to EDWARD LANDRUM whose telephone number is (571)272-5567. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Boyer Ashley can be reached on 571-272-4502. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/E. F. L./
Examiner, Art Unit 3724
1/27/2009

/Boyer D. Ashley/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3724